

Attorney Docket No: 3467-72965  
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	William B. Greenwald	Confirmation No. 9232
Serial No.:	10/692,839	Art Unit: 3637
Filed:	October 24, 2003	Examiner: Tran, Hanh Van
For:	Telescoping Slide Assembly With Quick-Mount Keyhole Lock System	

**REPLY BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed December 28, 2007.

The Examiner's Answer at page 11 addresses the argument in the Appellant's Appeal Brief at pages 6-8. With regard to such argument the Examiner's Answer at page 12 states:

the examiner respectfully takes the position that if in the locked position, the lock arm 256 and the top flat face of the head portion 255 would be in the same plane and a hole is provided in the lock arm 256, then at least a portion of the top flat face of the head portion 255 would extend into the hole provided in the lock arm 256, thus meets the claimed limitation of the mounting post received in the retention aperture.

This argument assumes "in the locked position, the lock arm 256 and the top flat face of the head portion 255 would be in the same plane" but that is not disclosed in Brock et al. In the locked position in Brock et al., the lock arm 256 and the top flat face of the head portion 255 may be in parallel closely adjacent planes, but they would not be in the same plane and thus the mounting post would not be received in the keyhole-shaped slot as claimed. Accordingly, this argument in the examiner's answer is not supported and is not persuasive.

The Examiner's Answer at page 12 urges, with respect to claim 2, that:

the examiner respectfully takes the position that the actuator of Brock, such as shown in Figs 16-17, which includes the inclined portion and the portion opposite rivets 258 meets the claimed limitation of the actuator having 'means for intercepting a mounting post....to block removal of the mounting post from narrow-width post-retainer portion and the retention aperture.'

Brock's disclosure with regard to Figs. 16-17 clearly shows that the lock arm 256 (actuator) does not provide the claimed means. First, it is noted that the above-quoted phrase in the Examiner's Answer leaves out the functional wording of the means clause. Such functional wording is replaced in the above quoted phrase with "...". Thus, it appears that the Examiner's Answer disregards the importance of the function in the means clause. Specifically, the means clause states the means is for "intercepting a mounting post moving into the enlarged-diameter entry and exit portion and bending the body to cause the body to move away from the load-carrying slide so that the mounting post can pass from the enlarged-diameter entry and exit portion of the keyhole-shaped slot into the narrow-width post-retainer portion...." This function is not possible in Brock et al. Brock et al. states:

The chassis 250 is positioned over the slides 10 so that the mounting pins 252 are aligned with the slots 254, as illustrated in FIG. 14. The chassis 250 is then lowered onto the slides 10 so that the mounting pins 252 extend into the transversely extending portions 262 of the slots 254. The chassis 250 is then moved rearwardly with respect to the telescoping portions 14 of the slides 10 to engage the mounting pins 252 in the longitudinally extending portions 260 of the slots 254, as illustrated in FIG. 15. This prevents vertical movement of the chassis 250 with respect to the slides 10.... When the chassis 250 is moved rearwardly with respect to the slides 10, the head portions 255 of the mounting pins 252 ride over the inclined surfaces of the raised portions 263 of the lock arms 256. The lock arms 256 flex outwardly to allow passage of the mounting pins 252 in the associated slots 254. When the mounting pins reach the ends of the longitudinally extending portions 262 of the slots 254, the raised portions 260 of the locks 256 prevent passage of the mounting pins 252 in the opposite direction, thereby locking the chassis 250 in place. (Column 7, lines 14-45).

It is clear that placement of the mounting pin 252 into slot 254 does not contact lock arm 256 until the mounting pin is moved rearwardly and the head portion 255 of the mounting pin 252 rides over the inclined surface of the raised portion 263 of the lock arm 256. The Examiner's Answer at page 11, lines 7-10 admits that in the combination of Brock et al., in view of Lauchner the raised portion 263 of Brock et al. would be replaced by the retention aperture. Thus, in the proposed combination of Brock et al., in view of Lauchner, there is no raised portion 263 and the lock arm 256 is not flexed outwardly at all. Clearly, in the proposed modification of Brock et al. and Lauchner there is no means, as recited in Appellant's claim 2, for intercepting a mounting post moving into the enlarged-diameter entry and exit portion and bending the body to cause the body to move away from the load-carrying slide so that the mounting post can pass from the enlarged-diameter entry and exit portion of the keyhole-shaped slot into the narrow-width post-retainer portion.

The Examiner's Answer at page 13 urges that the argument re claim 2 is also applicable to claim 21. Claim 21 avoids the prior art for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 2 and for the reasons noted in the Appeal Brief.

No other arguments not already addressed in Appellant's Brief are present in the Examiner's Answer.

For the foregoing reasons, and those in Appellant's Appeal Brief, Appellant, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-31 be reversed and the application with claims 1-31 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP



Richard B. Lazarus  
Registration No. 48,215  
Tel. No. (202) 289-1313